

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Each volume contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.
Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, N. Y.
Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).
Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXVIII, No. 19

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1935

WHOLE NO. 763

REVIEWS

The Magical Art of Virgil. By Edward Kennard Rand. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (1931). Pages xi, (iii), 458.

Professor Rand's book, *The Magical Art of Virgil*¹, partly represents the publication of lectures delivered on two foundations². He explains³ that his motives for writing it were, first, to suggest how, by following the work of Professor Lowes on Coleridge⁴, "the true method of examining an author's relation to his 'sources' may be applied not only to a modern writer . . . , but also to an ancient like Virgil", secondly⁵, "to illustrate those epic tendencies which were an essential part of the poet's <Virgil's> temperament", and, thirdly⁶, "to combine these two aims in an exposition of the contents of his <Virgil's> poems accompanied by an interpretation of his purpose and his art"

Thus, though the greater part of the *Aeneid* is not treated, there is a principle of unity and at least partial completeness in Professor Rand's presentation of the development of Vergil's poetry, subject to the influences to which he was exposed and the interests which successively inspired him. The early poems (including pieces in the Appendix Vergiliana) and the *Georgics* are paraphrased, and discussed at considerable length, but the account of the *Aeneid* is almost limited to the tragedy of Dido and the visits of Aeneas to Cumae and to the site of Rome.

The following is an outline of the chief doctrines of the book; in the notes to this review I make some comments upon them.

¹The contents of the book are as follows: Preface (vii-x); <Table of> Contents; I, Virgil's Magic and his Literary Goal (3-33); II, The Prelude to the *Bucolics* (34-67); III, Epic From Pastoral (*Elegiques* II, III, V, IV) (68-113); IV, Pastoral Allegory and Contemporary Events (*Elegiques* VII, VIII, IX, VI, I) (114-152); V, Virgil's Arcadia (*Elegique* X) (153-175); VI, Works and Days—A Challenge to Hesiod (176-226); VII, The Philosophy of Vine and Tree—A Challenge to Hesiod and to Lucretius (227-267); VIII, The Animals of the Farm—A Challenge to Lucretius and to Ennius (268-306); IX, The Human Bees and the Story of Orpheus—A Challenge to Homer (307-346); X, Virgil and the Drama (347-381); XI, Tragedy from Romance (382-414); XII, Primitive Simplicity From Imperial Rome (415-446); Index (449-458).

The printing is very good. The misprints that I have noted are few and unimportant. The reference "Cf. Ed., I, 1" (43, note 1) should have been printed after, not before, the Latin quotation; dots are omitted over the i's of *Vergilio* (68); *factum* (104, note 2) should be *factum*; the double quotation marks after the word "granted" (147) are unnecessary; *immissis* is wrongly printed for *immissus* (246, in the second quotation); the quotation beginning with *laudato* (249) is wrongly set; *torreus* (330) should be *torrens*; a hyphen is omitted (338, after "composi"); and the spelling "gayety" (421) is not recognized by the Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (Oxford University Press, 1925), to which reference is made in the book (9).

²See Preface, vii-ix. ³Preface, vii.

⁴See John Livingston Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu*, A Study in the Ways of the Imagination (London, Constable and Company). This work was published first in 1927; a revised and enlarged edition appeared in 1933. I quote from the 1933 edition, by the name Lowes and page numbers only. ⁵Preface, ix. ⁶Preface, x.

Vergil's early life and mental development are quite intelligible. Most of the Appendix Vergiliana was written by Vergil⁷. The ancient biographies of Vergil are on the whole coherent and trustworthy. An epic spirit⁸, implicit in Vergil from the beginning, gradually gains

⁷Compare 34-67. All the 'minor poems', except two, are accepted as having been written by Vergil. The *Moretum* is rejected (61) on account of its realism and the lack of ancient authority. The *Lydia*, too, is rejected (64-66), because (66) its "... Morbid refinement, romantic yearnings, and lack of humor are not Virgilian" Such aesthetic arguments are risky, but here, I think, sufficient. It might have been added that the *Moretum* shows the influence of the maturer Vergil (mainly in verse technique). The other 'minor poems' are provisionally accepted because (16) "the picture <of Vergil's early life and development> that may be formed <from them> is too striking and too plausible lightly to be thrown aside . . ." This is certainly true, literally. Professor Rand admits candidly that the difficulties (15) and "the cloud of hypothesis" involved (16) must always be remembered. Yet I am by no means sure that he does in fact allow full force to the contrary arguments, especially when he accepts as Vergilian the *Culex* and the *Aetna*. Vergil might well have written nearly such poems in his youth; but surely the *extant* *Culex* and *Aetna* are both proved post-Vergilian by the argument from logical priority of phrases, which occur, in both those poems, at an obviously later stage in their history than in Vergil himself or in his approximate contemporaries. Compare especially, for the *Culex*, Robert S. Radford, *The Culex and Ovid*, Philologus 86 (New Series, 40: 1927), 68-117. In my opinion Professor Radford proves, if not Ovidian authorship, at least Ovidian influence. For the *Aetna* compare the editions of Sudhaus (*Aetna*, Erklärt von Siegfried Sudhaus [Leipzig, Teubner, 1898]; see 80-83, and the parallels cited on 2-43), and Ellis (*Aetna*, A Critical Recension . . . With Prolegomena . . . , by Robinson Ellis [Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1901], xxx-xxiii). To these may be added my few remarks in *The Journal of Roman Studies* 24 (1934), 106, in which I suggest that the arguments of Ellis can be carried further. To show that Vergil might well have written early in his life a poem on *Aetna* Professor Rand might have cited the edition of that poem by Vessereau (*L'Aetna, Poème . . . par J. Vessereau* [Paris, "Les Belles Lettres", 1928]); on pages viii-xxii of that work this possibility is very thoroughly and learnedly argued. <The remarks in *The Journal of Roman Studies* 24:106 to which Mr. Knight refers above occur in a review of Vessereau's book. Mr. Knight disputes M. Vessereau's view that Vergil wrote the *extant* *Aetna*. C. K.>. Professor Rand could have made the force of logical priority usefully explicit when (85, note 3) with *Elegiques* 3, 63 *suave rubens hyacinthus* he compared *Ciris* 96, *Priapea* 3, 13, *Copa* 19, *Catullus* 61, 7. He argues persuasively (47-50, 143) that the *Ciris* was written by Vergil, not by Gallus, in opposition to the theory of F. Skutsch, *Aus Virgils Frühzeit* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1901, 1906), especially when (47-48, 143) he uses arguments from the successive and inconsistent forms of the legend of Scylla in *Ciris* 56-61, *Elegiques* 6, 74-77, *Georgics* 1, 404-409, and *Aeneid* 3, 420-428. Perhaps the importance of the inconsistencies is exaggerated. For a possible contrary use of the arguments from repetition see John Sparrow, *Half-Lines and Repetitions in Virgil*, 76 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1931). Professor Rand argues well (49-50) in favor of dating the *Ciris* about 50 B. C., and aptly compares the recorded work of Helvius Cinna.

⁸It will readily be conceded to Professor Rand that Vergil's early poetry shows often the promise of his later brilliance in epic. The comment (46) on the verses preserved at the close of the *Catalepton* (finishing with *et rudis in vario carmine Calliope*) is excellent. There are, however, overstatement, and too much rigidity in defining passages of Vergil as epic in quality. Vergil's temperament is called (23) "essentially epic" This judgment is not nearly so significant as it at first sight may appear to be, partly because Vergil's temperament was essentially so much else besides epic, and partly because the very meaning of the word *epic* was profoundly changed by Vergil's life. The word "epic", then, here means not much more than "Vergilian". If *Georgics* 2, 86 *orchades et radii et amara pausia baca* is epic (231), surely *Georgics* 1, 506-507 *non illus aratru dignus honor, squalent abductis arva colonis*, might also have been called epic, just as well as "Georgic" (225; compare also for this rigid classification 223-224, 259, 275, 303, 314-315, 319). It is hardly fair (173) to regard the pastoral panegyric of *Calpurnius* as an "utter failure . . ." because he has "no breath of the epic spirit which exalts Virgil's *Bucolics*" For an estimate of *Calpurnius* which, in my opinion, is more true compare E. Cesareo, *La Poesia di Calpurnio Siculo*, especially 185-192 (published, at Palermo, by the author, in 1931).

strength, until the Aeneid is created by it. The Eclogues are imaginative compositions, without rigid local realism or personal allegory; the allegory in the Aeneid is also subtle and fluid.⁹ In the Georgics Vergil represents the whole life of the farmer, including the "religion of work", which, as Hesiod also understood, is necessary to that life¹⁰. The encounter of Aeneas and Dido is a true tragedy, with a moral conflict: Vergil pitied both¹¹. Among Vergil's qualities are humor, reticence, sympathy for mankind and for all growing things, and freedom from insincerity, from ostentation, and from sentimentality¹². One of his chief characteristics is his "magi-

⁹Professor Rand's views on Vergilian allegory are sane and now well known. Actualities, he holds, are not precisely reported in the poetry, but sometimes they "shimmer through . . ." — a brilliant Teutonism. For examples see 30, 136, 377, 419. The sentence (64) ". . . It is ever Virgil's way to merge the actual in the typical and ideal, and thus to make its reality the brighter . . ." is both gracefully written, and, within its limits, as true as it could be. Servius is censured and ridiculed for his excessive belief in allegory (73-75, 132, 150-151, and elsewhere); the contrast is rather too sharp when he is implicitly trusted in other matters, as on pages 388-389. It is possible that Professor Rand has gone too far, and that he has not fully met the theory of Léon Herrmann, *Les Masques et Les Visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile* (Brussels, "La Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles", 1930), that the same name always represents the same person in all the Eclogues in which it occurs. This is to some extent true for Calpurnius (see Cesareo [as cited in note 8, above], 101, and elsewhere). The argument that Titurus does not represent Vergil himself in Eclogue 1 (151) might be called subjective. Inference from Vergil's modesty is too confident. Professor Rand declares (122) that Vergil "would not end his poem <Eclogue 7> by throwing up his cap and shouting, 'Virgil, Virgil forever . . .' , and (135) that ". . . rôle of chief singer is not one that he <Vergil> would voluntarily select . . ." Care is always needed in judging the ancients by ourselves. Professor Rand himself, though he is most unwilling to believe Vergil capable of anything which is offensive to us, tentatively accepts (45-46) Catalepton 13, in spite of its unpleasant language; for it he blames not Vergil, but Archilochus, Horace, and others.

¹⁰The account of Hesiod (176-192) is very good and useful. The nature of his influence on Vergil is well asserted (see, for example, 201-202, 205).

¹¹The account of the tragic movement and tragic forces of Aeneid 4 (347-364) seems to me excellent. The qualities of the Greek tragedians are well distinguished. Vergil is characterized by Professor Rand as closer to Sophocles than to Euripides, but his solution of the tragic problem is the solution of Aeschylus (368-372): here I suggest a comparison with my remarks on Aeschylus, in the abstract of my paper, *The Tragic Vision of Aeschylus*, Proceedings of the American Philological Association 64 (1933), lxiv-lxv. For Vergil, says Professor Rand, fate is moral (372), "not what Hardy misconceives Aeschylean fate to be . . ." (368). Reference might have been made here to R. S. Conway, *New Studies of a Great Inheritance* (London, Murray, 1921): see 140-144, especially 159-162, on the influence of the gods in the tragedy. It is not in all senses true that no other end to Vergil's drama could be conceived (364); Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra notably achieves the tragic solution by a means opposite to the habitual method of the drama, for there the ending is explicitly happy, and the claim of love prevails, almost paradoxically, over the claim of empire. However, Professor Rand has shown real insight in this part of his book: one of the best passages of all is the treatment (402), by reference to the original in Apollonius, of the robe that had been given by Dido to Aeneas; the depth of feeling in the one word *quondam* (Aeneid 11.74) is especially well indicated.

¹²Here again Professor Rand is right, at least in general. But he does not always avoid hasty overstatement. Seeking to show that the author of the poem called Lydia is too romantic to have been Vergil himself, he assumes (66) that the author of that piece calls the sky green, and he remarks that this author "rather runs to green . . ." This remark is itself delicately humorous, and shows one of Professor Rand's gifts. But surely the criticism is not sound. I can find only one other mention of the color green in the poem, in aut roseis digitis viridem decerpserat uvam (114); there *viridem* is almost inevitable as a foil to *roseis*. Even in the expression that Professor Rand criticizes, *viridis mundo* (142), the meaning "sky, firmament" is not, so far as I can see, inevitable, for *mundus* might mean "world", as it does soon afterwards in the poem (149).

A sharply defined and careful use of conceptions such as "romanticism" is always needed. Professor Rand almost too frequently defends Vergil against the possible charge of romanticism, but afterwards so much weakens his condemnation of the romantic that his former arguments lose much of their force (as on pages 157-160). He even writes (413), ". . . I would not be numbered among the foes of romance . . ." and ". . . Nothing is too romantic for Virgil . . .", and adds ". . . Perhaps we are juggling with words . . ." — a real danger in discussions of this kind.

I am inclined to depurate the defense of Vergil at all costs against every charge, partly because I think that his greatness is unaltered by any faults which can be proved against him, and partly because such an inflexible defense is liable to give away more than it guards. It is wiser to agree that Vergil admits conceptions which

cal" power of transmuting older elements into a new artistic whole, according to a partly unconscious process of assimilation, memory, and imaginative recombination, a process which Professor Lowes, by means of research into the art of Coleridge, has successfully described¹³. In this way a satisfactory account of the dependence of Vergil upon his sources can be given; he

can be considered examples of the pathetic fallacy—if it is a fallacy after all—(compare 97, 146, 165-166, 305-306: in the last two passages, however, a good point is made), that he sometimes has slight incongruities (compare 270-279, 294, 337), that Lucretius has a deeper sympathy with animals than Vergil has (compare 238, 277-279, 296-302), and that Vergil's scientific knowledge may not have been as perfect as it was possible for it to be (compare 335-336). Other examples of the tendency to carry to an extreme the defense of Vergil might be found (compare, perhaps, 42-43, 93, 106, 203, 227, 237-238, 261, 277-278, 292-293, 380).

On such matters as this reference should now be made to a book entitled *Virgilio, El Poeta y su Misión Providencial*, by Aurelio Esposito Pólit, S. J. (Quito, Ecuador, Editorial Ecuatoriana, 1932). I cite this work by the name Pólit, and page numbers only. This book is useful in defining the personal quality of Roman poets in distinction from classical Greek and Hellenistic writers (Pólit, 134-168, especially 153-159), and the personal quality of Vergil himself in contrast with that of other Roman poets (Pólit, 167-206, especially 170-175). The specific merit of Vergil, in important aspects, is here clearly stated.

¹³See vii, 10-15, and elsewhere. The application—suggested by Professor Lowes himself (Lowes, 427)—to Vergil of the results reached in *The Road to Xanadu* is, in my opinion, of immense importance. It is of quite secondary interest that Professor Rand's treatment of the matter is not always sufficiently analytical and exact. He regularly uses the word "magic" to describe the poetic process; but, after quoting (9) from the Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English a definition of "magic", he proceeds to use the word in a sense which seems arbitrarily limited to describe the function by which one substance is mysteriously transmuted into another (9-10). This usage probably owes something to a sentence of Coleridge quoted by Professor Lowes (Lowes, 61): "That synthetic and magical power . . . the imagination . . . must perforate blend and (as it were) fuse them, each into each". The word "magic" involves Professor Rand in difficulties, perhaps in tautology. For example, he admits (444) that ". . . All good poetry is magic in a way . . .", but he claims that Vergil's poetry is magical in some peculiar sense. This increases the uncertainty left by an earlier remark (23), that ". . . Magic, like genius, . . . is an infinite capacity for taking pains . . ."; surely, magic and genius are practically synonymous here. Secondly, "magic" seems elsewhere to mean rather the ability to set down in writing some simple factual incongruity. The statement (21) that ". . . Corydon is a magician . . ." is given as a reason why flowers which should appear, in nature, at different seasons are found together in Eclogue 2. Of Vergil's incorrect account of the Porta Carmentalis Professor Rand writes (428), ". . . what though it be one of the gates of the later Servian Wall, our magician can pick it up and set it where he likes. . . . Surely any one can, for a sufficient reason, misrepresent facts. Thirdly, magic is distinguished also from poetic ability (34): "Vergil was born a poet, but he was also made <a poet>". He was not born a magician, but he gradually acquired the magical art . . . (compare, however, 22-23, where this idea is well expanded). Magic, therefore, is a power to combine elements not originally coherent; it is distinct from both genius and poetic power. Apparently, then, it corresponds with the shaping will and intelligence of the poet in Professor Lowes's theory (see Lowes, 623, Index, under Imagination). But this, for Professor Lowes himself, seems to be the specifically poetic function: the unconscious processes by which images and ideas are stored and associated in "the deep well of unconscious cerebration" (Lowes, 56, quoting Henry James) are not characteristically poetic, but common also to ordinary minds (Lowes, 429-432). Compare these utterances by Lowes: (431) "Creative genius, in plainer terms, works through processes which are common to our kind, but these processes are superlatively enhanced"; (432) "But in genius of the highest order that . . . energy . . . is controlled by a will which serves a vision—the vision which sees order in chaos, the potentiality of Form"; (433) "And the goal of the shaping spirit which hovers in the poet's brain is the clarity and order of pure beauty". If, therefore, Vergil was born a poet in Professor Lowes's sense, apparently he was born with the informative power which Professor Rand may mean by "magic", that is, he was born a magician, and there is a contradiction. If, on the other hand, "magic" is the general power of associating ideas, Professor Rand seems to be in disagreement with Professor Lowes, unintentionally, since he attributes (11) to Professor Lowes's results an "uncanny and indisputable exactness. . . . I do not think that 'magic' is a suitable term here for use in scientific argument. Of course, it can be employed in poetic description, though that needs much economy and skill, since the word is so much worn by use. In this, however, Professor Rand can succeed, in spite of the difficulty, as when he says (31) of the construction of the Aeneid, ". . . Enough magic is in all that to madden an ordinary brain". It seems that answers are now required to the questions whether Vergil's method agrees in fact with that of Coleridge, in what respects the method of Vergil is unusual among ancient poets and also among poets in general, and whether Vergilian research confirms Professor Lowes's theory, or suggests modifications in it.

... room so true on the considerate Aeneas states isolate difficult of Virg... mentally really interpret

proved himself original in the most difficult way, by submitting to tradition¹⁴.

All these doctrines deserve statement, and many, perhaps most, of them may claim wide, or even general, assent. But they are not always presented in the most precise and effective manner, and even some which are very important appear weakened by a lack of objectivity and cohesion¹⁵. Words are used without very careful economy, and they are sometimes chosen and com-

¹⁴See 178. The application of Professor Lowes's theory enables Professor Rand to reach sound estimates of the true nature of Vergilian 'imitation', for example when he explains (269-270) the emotional effect of the reminiscence of Ennius in Georgics 3.8-9 *victorque virum volitare per ora*, and, in general, when he describes (27-33) the relation of the Aeneid to its main sources. That "... Virgil is aware of the various flavors in the poetry of his predecessors..." (253) is exactly true. Sometimes, however, the emphasis of remarks made by Professor Rand can be criticized adversely. On page 176 he writes, "... <Vergil> is not trying <in the Bucolics> for something novel or bizarre; he is expressing himself. For this expression, he studies, with the most patient care, his predecessors... that he may at once identify himself with the proper tradition and attest his originality by transforming it". This passage is otherwise admirable, but surely it is unfair, if not inconsistent, to lay such emphasis on Vergil's purpose to be original; if he had not been original, he could not have been expressing himself. Elsewhere, perhaps, ostentation is too readily imputed to Vergil, as in the statement (181) that "... <Vergil> obviously wishes the reader to observe first what Aratus did, and then what he might have done". The important results of A.-M. Guillemin's presentation, *L'Originalité de Virgile*, 125-133 (Paris, "Les Belles Lettres", 1931), do not prevent poetic quality and expression from being the first care of great poets. For a very good recent treatment of this question compare Ettore Bignone, *L'Idillio VIII di Teocrito e la sua Autenticità*, Atene e Roma 35 (1913), 30-36. In explaining (214) the repetition in Georgics 1.406-409 of Ciris 538-541, Professor Rand writes that Vergil felt that he had outgrown the Ciris, and suggests that for this reason he plundered that poem. The suggestion is quite unnecessary, as many other repetitions show: for example with Georgics 4.475-477 compare Aeneid 6.306-308. Vergil treated his own work in a former poem almost as he treated the work of other poets (see Sparrow [as cited in note 7, above], 90, 92, 110-111).

On 'imitations' by poets in general, and by Homer in particular, compare now Pölit, 36-133 (see note 12, above, at the end). Pölit discusses them with reference to Vergil. He refers to Professor Rand's book, but on this question is comparatively independent of it. He is perhaps too ready, in some instances, to draw conclusions from the work of M. Victor Bérard, but his main point can be accepted, and richly supported, especially from linguistic researches. Vergil's "imagination auditive" might almost be called Homeric. It should be remembered, also, that this faculty varied greatly in strength and use during the periods of ancient poetry.

¹⁵I give examples of judgments which seem to me unsatisfactory. Professor Rand writes (70), "... These two passions of the poet's mind <for pastoral and for epic poetry>, his ruling passions, were destined like two chemical substances to be fused in a third which is neither the one nor the other but both...". But surely a third passion would not have been expected to be the same as either of the two original passions, or even to be no more than both of them together. It is hard to see whether Professor Rand was thinking of mechanical mixtures or of chemical compounds, or whether he considered the passions as forces, and regarded the third passion as a resultant. Perhaps, however, he was influenced here more by the sentence of Coleridge quoted in note 13, above.

Again, to say (275) that Vergil, since he can endure ugliness, is "no aesthete...", and to contrast him (286) with "lewd moderns", is surely to misunderstand a familiar quality of poets new and old, who are often fascinated by any strongly individual realities, good and evil alike. This is to be understood best by conversation with living poets, a source of information useful to scholarship. The criticism of the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius (394-407) seems to require more careful distinction between the reality of characters as human beings (396), "individuality", "personality", "persons" (397), and human feeling and character (404), to make it quite clear that the writer's opinion has not changed during the discussion. The sentence (407) "... He <Vergil> doubtless had studied other poems besides the Argonautica..." indicates haste. That (414) "... His <Vergil's> sympathy for the fate of his characters has no room for rebellion against the governing issues of life..." is hardly so true as the statement (144) that "... Vergil is always pondering on the ultimate questions..."; the two remarks seem scarcely consistent. Vergil must have faced a terrible conflict before he accepted the universe, if he ever did accept it; compare C. M. Bowra, *Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal*, Greece and Rome 3 (1933), 8-21. The statement (442) that "... If any poet needed to be judged not by isolated passages but by all that he wrote, it is Vergil..." opens a difficult question; Professor Rand himself writes (15) that "Not all of Vergil is perfect art...", and that Vergil himself avoided the mention of his own early works. Professor Rand is, of course, not really one who would claim seriously (426) the power to give an interpretation whereby "the full force of Vergil's magic may be appreciated..."

bined without sufficient attention to fitness and grace¹⁶. There are a few inaccuracies¹⁷.

Perhaps the plan of the book, designed to achieve three objects, one of which is itself a combination of exposition and interpretation, was unfortunate. With so many purposes to be fulfilled, it must have been hard indeed to concentrate thought upon exact argument; few others, probably, would have succeeded as well as Professor Rand has succeeded. To these difficulties is added another, the difficulty of satisfying fairly the claims of both science and art. To establish conclusions by argument the method should be scientific; to communicate emotional appreciation the method should be artistic. Both methods are required by the scope of this work. Such books as this are easy to criticize, but to write them successfully is very difficult indeed. Professor Rand's reputation is safe, and, apart from the sanity of his views and the importance of some of his conclusions, the sympathetic and human vitality of this book will increase it. But some readers will think that he could have achieved much more positive and secure results, with his fine critical instruments, if he had been able to rewrite his manuscript as a shorter book of exact

¹⁶The following expressions, some of which are parts of paraphrases or translations of Vergil, seem reprehensible: "... Father Ennius..." (28); "*Achilles*,> Homer's ferocious old boy..." (32; quoted, without a reference, from Holmes, with apparent approval); "... (God save the mark!)..." (69); "... merry wench ..." (85); "Let us sing a somewhat loftier strain..." (100); "... the sluggish vines have just begun to burgeon..." (118); "... the adumbrations of Virgil's literary ideals..." (122); "... feed sleek sheep but pipe a slender song..." (137); "... Tityrus in the First Eclogue recalls his liaisons with Galatea and Amaranthus merely for the purpose of verifying a date nor is it a date with Amaranthus..." (171); "The awesome magician into which the romantic fancy of the Middle Ages transformed our poet must bow, rather clumsily, to the actual man, as to a master in his own art" (196); "... venturesome emprise" (198); "... raucous murmur..." (200); "... if my brain is murky with penumbral fogs..." (254); "... My fame, too, must flit from lip to lip!..." (270); "... to as long a glory as that which runs from the birth of Tithonus to his own times..." (271); "... rushes about..." (284); "... call aloud in a lofty strain..." (287); "... sacred soul..." (374); "... Euripides... leaves the question of Hippolytus and Phaedra in a blur..." (410).

¹⁷I add some criticism of detail, not all strictly of inaccuracies. It is hardly a "brilliant and novel idea..." (32) that in Aeneid 10 the gods should abstain from war, that now the epic battles might be "purely human..."; compare, of course, Homer, Iliad 8.1-27, especially 10-12. Moretum 36 (translated on page 60: in the reference in note 2 to page 60 correct "31" to "32") is usually rejected. Horace is cited (68) without a reference (the passage is to be found in Sermones 1.10.44-45); Priapus is more than a scarecrow (117-118, 314). Keightley is cited (166) without a sufficient reference. The Sibylline, or even Hebraic, quality of Eclogue 4 should not be minimized (107-108), at least without meeting the strong, if not decisive, arguments drawn by R. G. Austin, Virgil and the Sibyl, The Classical Quarterly 21 (1927), 100-105, from the metrical arrangement of the poem; Professor Rand himself well recognizes (205) Hesiodic structure in Georgics 2. The invocation of Venus in Lucretius 1.1-43 does not really involve inconsistency (197); it is a statement of the religion of life, not necessarily theological, a religion which poets can scarcely escape. The word *docus*, applied to Hesiod by Cicero, De Senectute 54, principally means not "practical" (199), but "poetic" or "inspired". The expression *imperat arvis* is more than "lords it over the fields" (200); this is either a military metaphor or an "etymological" usage. *Tribula* are not (204) "harrows" (for that sense *tribuli* is used), but "threshing sledges", according to Lewis and Short. The monosyllabic *sus* at the end of a verse (Georgics 3.255) need not be humorous (284); compare especially Aeneid 3.300, 8.83. That besides the outline of the story there is little of the Odyssey in the Aeneid (339), and that Odysseus and Aeneas have little in common (391) are overstatements; it might even be held that the Odyssey with its patient, self-dependent, reflective hero is a main foundation of the Aeneid. It is at least uncertain that (341) Vergil's trust in Gallus was broken after the fall of Gallus (compare Conway [as cited in note 11, above], 110-111). "Hercules" is printed for "Heracles" (396, 397), and "Cupid" for "Eros" (403). Tarpeia was surely not a Sabine maiden (420), but a Roman maiden (Livy 1.11). It seems to be untrue that the Shield of Achilles would be as impossible to make as the Shield of Aeneas (for this suggestion see 432); compare H. L. Lorimer, Homer's Use of the Past, The Journal of Hellenic Studies 49 (1929), 148. The probable symbolic meaning of the Cumæan gates (434) might have been mentioned. It is doubtful whether *quam tua te...* (435) is a better reading than *qua tua te...* in Aeneid 6.90.

analysis, and they will regret a missed opportunity. Even they, however, will have their recompense in the true and finely said things which the book nevertheless contains¹⁸.

BLOXHOM SCHOOL,
NEAR BANBURY,
OXFORDSHIRE, ENGLAND

W. F. J. KNIGHT

A First Book in Latin. By Wren Jones Grinstead and Walter V. McDuffee. New York: D. Appleton and Company (1933). Pp. xvii, 453, 71. \$1.48.

Messrs. Grinstead and McDuffee, in the volume under review, *A First Book in Latin*, adhere faithfully to the functional method of presenting the facts of the Latin language with which they deal. By means of this method the pupil meets the various forms and constructions in a context, and is led carefully to deduce their meaning and their purpose before he encounters formal tables of paradigms and grammatical rules. Indeed, in this book, in which the fruits of experience in the classroom may frequently be seen, the functional method is presented in its most favorable light.

The authors adhere also to the case-paradigm method of presenting declensions. For instance, in the reading matter the accusative case of nouns of all five declensions is put before the pupil in such a way that the similarity of the terminations of the case in all the declensions is impressed upon his mind. A systematic effort is made to emphasize such similarities of termination as well as the identity of the constructions in which this case is found. This method, as has been conclusively shown, is far more efficient, and undoubtedly more desirable pedagogically, than the formal memorization of vertical paradigms. Verb-forms are developed by tenses in all conjugations simultaneously.

It is a pleasure to find a book which gives correctly

¹⁸I add further examples of some very good things in the book. Vergil's early work may be faulty because he had not allowed his impressions to settle long enough in the "deep well of unconscious cerebration" (17). The harmonization of elements in Eclogue 2 is well explained (80), and the method well defended against Jahn, with an interesting comparison of Monet's painting (87-88). The inconsistency of Servius in his account of allegory is well shown (92-93). The historical position of Octavianus in 40 B. C. is well used in discussing (106-107) Eclogue 4, and Samuel Johnson is well quoted (108) for the belief that Vergil first wrote this eclogue for a different purpose, and later altered it. Compare now W. W. Tarn, Alexander Helios and the Golden Age, The Journal of Roman Studies 22 (1932), 135-160, especially 153-158 (against him Professor Rand could hardly maintain that the child is Pollio's). The dramatic significance of intentionally weak verses in Eclogue 7 is well shown (116-120). The statement (138) that Vergil tells the story of Pasiphae "with a touch of shuddering pity that recalls the curious pathos of the *Ciris*. . ." is one of Professor Rand's brilliant felicities. The view of Servius that Vergil was a consistent Epicurean who sugarcoated Epicurean doctrine with myth is well confuted (142): Vergil needs myth to supplement science if he is to reach truth. The monument at Catania, which claims that Stesichorus invented pastoral, is interestingly cited (168). The expression (201) ". . . an experienced farmer must expect anything . . ." is amusing and apt. The exclamation (203), ". . . What poetry could he < Vergil > have made out of modern agricultural machines! . . ." contains much truth. There is (209-211) a fine analysis, after Kennedy, of the description of a storm in Georgics 1.322-334. The ravens "full of some sweet unwonted joy. . ." are well treated (215), and delightfully described (225) as "the automatic but self-important prophets of changing atmospheres. . ." Some good criticism of Conington and Wilamowitz (220-221) shows how great is the need for books on Vergil's "magical art". There are excellent references to Palgrave and Goethe (236) in comments on Georgics 2.155-176. But there is nothing truer in the whole book than this (445): ". . . Better is the naïveté of the Virgilomaniac than the superiority of the Virgilomastix, qui dum poetæ inscientiam vult insectari, suam confitetur. It is both wiser and safer to study the nature of Virgil's success, with the help of commentators new and old, Servius above all, but especially with the companionship of his peers in poetry".

the meanings of *legatus*, as "staff-officer", "envoy", "representative".

A typical Lesson (Lesson V, §§ 25-29, pages 30-35) is made up as follows. The title of the Lesson as a whole is How the Use of a Noun is Shown in Latin. First comes a short selection of 'made Latin' entitled *Puer et Puella Ludunt*. In the selection an effort is made to set forth how the endings of the nominative and the accusative cases clearly show the use of a noun. It is the fundamental idea of the functional method that pupils shall deduce from actual reading the essential facts of a language. A list of ten new words that had occurred in the reading matter comes next. A short paragraph includes nine questions or suggestions which are designed to bring out the meaning of the passage which has just been read. The questions are such as to emphasize comprehension of the Latin rather than mere translation. Since the passage deals with the life of children, references are next given to three books that deal with Roman life, in order that interested pupils may read further about the subject. An imaginative picture of a peristyle is given at the top of page 31. In the following paragraph (26), under the caption Review and Drill, pertinent questions are asked about what the pupil has just read. Suggestions for vocabulary work come first. Pupils are then directed to pronounce carefully each starred word in §§ 23, 25, although no adequate instructions about pronunciation have yet been given as a guide. Questions about the conjugation of the verbs used in the reading selection are worded in such a way as to make the pupil think about the mechanical method of forming the present tense. Five English sentences are then given (page 32), together with a Latin translation of each. In each sentence a blank space is left in which pupils are to write the correct verb-form.

A short exercise follows (still in § 26) in which English words formed from Latin are used in complete sentences. The force of certain common prefixes is also presented for study. As in each Lesson, a paragraph for Honor Work comes next. Here the termination of plural forms is brought to the attention of pupils, and a hint about the agreement of adjectives is added to stimulate close observation of endings. In § 27 the authors discuss in detail the importance of terminations in showing the use of Latin nouns and they make a comparison with English to show that the position of nouns is all-important in English, but of far less consequence in Latin. In § 28 (pages 33-34) the authors follow this idea in a rather lengthy way to its logical conclusion, with particular reference to the reading material in the lesson (§ 25, page 30). Another paragraph of Honor Work (page 34) suggests the use of five cases in Latin, and invites pupils to "Frame a rule for the nominative case. . ." Section 29 (page 35) contains eight more lines of 'made Latin' in which the principles just discussed are clearly illustrated. A vocabulary of new words in this paragraph, and several comprehension questions follow, as in § 25 (page 30). A brief suggestion for still more Honor Work (on the cases which follow prepositions) closes the Lesson.

The whole text of the book is divided into "Units of Learning"; a Unit usually includes six Lessons. Most

Units close with a Review Lesson. Each Unit is intended to complete a study of a definite theme. Thus Unit 2 deals with How to Read Latin, Unit 5 with Dependent Elements of the Sentence, Unit 9 with Compound and Complex Sentences, Unit 10 with The Third Declension.

The authors submitted their 'made Latin', of which there is a good deal in the book, to a critic¹, but they assume, themselves, the responsibility for such errors as occur in the book. There are, unfortunately, many slips in this 'made Latin'. Perhaps the worst of these are the following: 291:417^{1a}, *exui*, in the sense of 'I put off payment <of a debt>'; 125:171, *pertinebat ad*, apparently in the sense of 'was bound for' (said of a ship); and 190:268, *vobis me contuli*, which is supposed to mean 'I came to you'^{1b}.

Both the authors and the publishers are responsible for the array of errors that this book contains. They should have realized that many teachers depend absolutely upon the textbook. Since this is so, it is the plain duty of those who are in charge of issuing a textbook to take the utmost pains to secure accuracy, in a word to maintain scholarship of the highest order.

Before discussing certain signal failures of the book, I shall list briefly some of the individual points which involve various kinds of inaccuracies, even in connection with the most obvious matters. I append in the footnotes references to authorities. In these footnotes I have purposely referred, so far as was possible, only to books that are very easily accessible.

145:202.—"C. (<is> an old form of G) . . ."²

305:437.—L, the "symbol" meaning *quinquaginta*, is described as "(the lower half of L, old form of C)".

296:425.—" . . . (NOTE: Long, clumsy adjectives, such as *necessarius*, are compared, as in English^{3a}, by the adverbs *magis*, *more*, and *maxime*, *most*, *very*.)" Nothing is said about the all-important point that the adjectives thus compared are adjectives whose stem ends in a vowel⁴. Moreover, the authors give *propinquus* as an adjective of this type. Yet in Ovid, *Tristia* 4.4.51 we find *propinquior*.

194:274.—"penates . . . the household gods of the Ro-

¹The critic was Dr. B. W. Mitchell, formerly Head of the Department of Ancient and Modern Languages in the Central High School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Dr. Mitchell's former title is incorrectly given (vii) by the authors of the book under review. <One must always reckon, in such matters as this, with the possibility—rather the high probability—that, as a result of the way a book is made, some, perhaps much, of the contents of the book in its final form was never seen by the critic at all. C. K.>.

<²aThe references to the book under review will be given to Section and page. A very bad feature of this book is that Sections often run over several pages, with no markings at all on some of the pages to show the number of the Section.

In the Latin quotations from the book the macrons will usually be omitted. C. K. >.

<^{3b}The expressions involved here are "Id <= aes alienum>, uris multo gravius factum, . . . agro patrio exui . . .", which the authors wish to mean "This debt, made far worse by unpaid interest, I put off (=I put off the payment of this debt), by mortgaging a farm . . ."; "Eo die in portu urbis navem inventi quae ad rem publicam pertinebat. Hac nave in mare cum litteris senatus <genitive> navigavit. . . ." I do not see how Dr. Gummere got the meaning "bound for" out of *pertinebat ad*. My guess is that the authors wanted this to mean "belonged to the Roman commonwealth". C. K. >.

⁴See Roland G. Kent, *The Sounds of Latin: A Descriptive and Historical Phonology*, § 15, III (The Linguistic Society of America, Language Monographs, Number XII [Baltimore, the Waverley Press, 1932]).

<^{5a}No adjective in English is compared with the help of *magis* or *maxime*. C. K. >.

^{5b}See Charles E. Bennett, *A New Latin Grammar* 74, 2. a (Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1918).

mans. They were statuettes representing Sacrifice was offered to them They were sometimes called *lares*, or *lares et penates*^{5c}.

194:275.—The perfect system of *revertor* is said to be deponent usually⁶ ("usually in passive form, *re-verto*, inf. *reverti*, perf. *reversus sum* . . .").

206:291.—*A propos* of *conor* we find: ". . . Many Latin verbs occur only in passive forms; such forms, however, having only active meanings" What about *conans*, *conaturus*, *conandus*, etc.?

310:445.—A fine Irish bull occurs here: ". . . Latin tends to omit repeated and unnecessary words"

33:39.—". . . a preposition, a kind of word that usually denotes some direction" East, North, West, South?

61:81.—"The numerals *one*, *two*, *three*, etc., are called cardinal numerals (from *cardo*, *hinge*), because the formation of the other numerals (*first*, *second*; *once*, *twice*; etc.) turns or depends upon them" These words imply that *primus* is formed from *unus*, *secundus* from *duo*, etc.

One of the most interesting 'howlers' deserves a paragraph to itself. In § 75, page 101, we read that *Afer* was "A Roman family name" Pupils are asked presently (75:103) to explain this name. I remind the authors that in Horace, *Carmina* 4.4.42 Hannibal is called *durus Afer*.

In § 103, page 142, under the caption Honor Work (found on page 140), this question is put to the pupil: "Where is the adjective usually placed in a Latin sentence? Is this always true?" The pupil is expected to say that in Latin the adjective usually is set after the noun to which it applies. Certain facts which do not bear out this idea have recently been published⁷.

⁶Probably the briefest clear discussion of this elementary feature of Roman religion is to be found in Cyril Bailey, *The Religion of Ancient Rome*, Chapter V (London, Constable and Co., 1921).

⁷See Bennett, 114, 3 (see note 4, above).

<⁷Dr. Gummere had in mind here a note which appeared in The Classical Journal 29:310-311 (January, 1934), in the Department called Hints for Teachers, conducted by Professor Dorrance S. White, of the University of Iowa. The note ran thus:

"A teacher who has just begun her first year has submitted the following questions: 1) What adjectives precede nouns and when?"

Bennett's Grammar, 350, 4, says: "No general law can be laid down for the position of adjectives. On the whole they precede the noun oftener than they follow it". Two scholarly articles on the subject may be found in the CLASSICAL JOURNAL: 'Latin Word Order', <Latin Word Order. C. K. >, by B. L. Ullman, Vol. XIV (1919), 404 ff. < = 404-417. C. K. >; and 'Some Facts of Latin Word Order', by A. T. Walker, Vol. XIII (1918), 644 ff. < = 644-657. C. K. >. Neither article has convinced all teachers of Latin that the adjective generally precedes or follows its noun. The editor of this department undertook an independent study in which generous selections from sixteen prose writers, ranging from Cato to Suetonius, were used. Before the work was nearly completed the adjectives (not counting adjectives of quantity) that preceded the noun were overwhelmingly predominant. The editor is convinced that Bennett's statement is correct. Certainly no teacher of high school Latin is justified in insisting that her pupils place the adjective regularly after the noun it modifies."

I may call attention here to a monograph entitled 'The Position of Possessive and Demonstrative Adjectives in the *Notae Atticae* of Aulus Gellius', by Edward Yoder. This is a University of Pennsylvania dissertation, published in September, 1928, as Language Dissertation II, by the Linguistic Society of America (Pp. 103). I give here, in the briefest possible form, some of Dr. Yoder's conclusions (96-99). The figures that follow represent total number of occurrences, number of instances in which the adjective precedes the noun, number of instances in which the adjective follows the noun: A. Possessive Adjectives, 409, 121, 288; 1s, 699, 679, 20; *idem*, 339, 328, 11; *hic*, 711, 499, 212; *ille*, 235, 154, 81; *iste*, 235, 95, 140; *ipse*, 213, 116, 97.

Mr. Yoder's "Master's Thesis", presented to the State University of Iowa in 1924, was entitled 'Position of Possessive and Demonstrative Pronouns in Cato and Varro'. A typewritten copy of this thesis is in the Library of the University of Iowa.

I should like to sound a warning here, to the effect that a count of the number of instances in which adjectives precede or follow

The authors use throughout *mille* in the singular with the genitive of the whole. They have classical authority for this usage⁸, but it is hardly wise to employ it in a beginners' book.

The subject of the pronunciation of Latin is wretchedly handled. In 15:18 the following directions are given: "... Sound the vowels as in the following sentence: 'Pa's red machine broke thru....'" The *a* of "Pa's", the *e* of "red", the *i* of "machine", the *o* of "broke", and the *u* of "thru" are indicated as the vowels which the authors intend to use as models for the pronunciation of certain Latin vowels. But in the Latin words for practice which follow immediately, we find *pilam* ('ball'), which has a short *i* (not a long *i*, as "machine" has), and *curro* and *sum*, each of which has a short *u* (not a long *u*, like the *u* in "thru")⁹. The authors are also ignorant of the difference between double consonants and doubled consonants (19:22)¹⁰. It is probably for this reason that they mark long the first vowel in *Mesentius* (e. g. 220:313). A diphthong is defined (44:56) as "Two or more vowels sounded together in one syllable...." It would pay the authors to look up the etymology of the word *diphthong*. Pupils are asked (44:56) whether diphthongs are long or short. There are no long diphthongs in classical Latin¹¹. Here, as in many other places, a lack of knowledge of phonology has led to a mistake. The authors meant to ask whether a syllable which contains a diphthong is long or short. The old mistake in the pronunciation of the diphthong *eu* is perpetuated (Appendix 25:7)¹².

There are only about twenty etymologies in the book to which *serious* objection may be made. But many others leave much to be desired. The authors did not realize that the use of the scientific symbols < and + calls for a *scientifically accurate statement* of the elements which compose a word. Thus they write (288:414) "triduum... (<tres + dies>....)" In so writing they make unnecessary trouble for themselves—and for their readers. *Triduum* is not derived from either of the words which the authors give as its constituent elements. It is derived from words etymologically connected with *tres* and with *dies*, but the use of the standard symbols, <, +, does not admit of such an interpretation of the statement I quoted above from 288:414. The use of these symbols makes not only this etymology, but many others entirely wrong. Thus the authors state that *triceps* comes from *tres* + *caput*, *participle* from *par*s + *capio*. It is phonetically impossible for *cogo* to be derived from *com* + *ago* (145:202), or for *coordinate* to come from *com* + *ordo* (217:307). *Parens* is said to be the present participle of *pario*, but a recent doctoral dissertation accepted by the University¹³ with which one of the authors of the book

their nouns is not in itself decisive. As circumstances alter cases, so circumstances alter position of adjectives, pronouns, genitives, etc. A final study of the whole problem must take account of all these varying circumstances and factors. C. K.>

⁸See Aulus Gellius 1.16.

⁹See Edgar H. Sturtevant, The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin, 15-36 (The University of Chicago Press, 1920).

¹⁰Kent, §§ 18, 21, 24 (see note 2, above).

¹¹Ibidem, § 120.

¹²Ibidem, § 40; Sturtevant, 61-63 (see note 9, above).

¹³See Merle M. Odgers, Latin Parenthetical Phrases, Its Meanings and Uses, 7 The Linguistic Society of America, Language Dissertation III Philadelphia, 1926).

under review is connected not only showed that this is not true, but also listed the authoritative articles which have been written on the subject. *Nolo* is not from *n* + *olo* (156:219)¹⁴; *poteo* is not an old form of *possum* (257:370)¹⁵; *scilicet* is from *scire* + *licet*, not from *scio* + *licet* (314:448)¹⁶. We read (272:392) that "... Sometimes, if the root <of a verb> ends in a sound made with the tip of the tongue¹⁷, the *t* of the <participial> suffix becomes *s:pulsus*, *missus* (for *mitt-tus*)". Aside from the unscientific wording of the statement, one finds ground for criticism in the fact that the statement is meant to explain to the pupil in a beginners' class an initial *s* in the final syllables of *pulsus* and *iussus*¹⁸.

The authors understand the double function of the *i* in *maior*, *peior*, etc. (164:231: the paragraph below the paradigm of *is*, *ea*, *id*)¹⁹, yet they mark the *u* of *maior* as long (see e. g. the Vocabulary. For *peior*, *peius* with macron over *e* see the Appendix 42:13). Other wrongly marked vowels are the *u* of *Etrisci*²⁰, the *a* of *quartus*²¹, the *e* of *emptum*²²; all are indicated as short. They should be marked long. It remains to be proved that the *e* of *vestigium* is long²³. The *i* of *Americanus* is marked long throughout. On that principle *America* ought to be pronounced with the accent on the penultimate syllable and the vowel of that syllable ought to be long, as in English *mine*. Misprints are found in *defero* (in 156:221 we find *dé-fero*, with first *e* short) and *rex* (the *e* without the macron, 166:235:... o rex optime), and in Primo <*sic!*> luce (Appendix 13.3).

There is a map opposite page 5 which is supposed to show the places on the earth where English, the Romance languages, and other Indo-European languages are spoken. It is extremely inaccurate²⁴.

¹⁴See Alois Walde, Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch², under *nolo* (Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1910). <A third edition of this work, by J. B. Hofmann, is under way. Seven parts have appeared, carrying the work into *fullo* (Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1930-1934). For a review, by Professor Edgar H. Sturtevant, of Parts 1-4 of this edition see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 25:135-136 (March 7, 1932). No student of the etymology of Latin words can afford to neglect the Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine: Histoire des Mots, by Alfred Ernout and Antoine Meillet (Paris, Klincksieck, 1931. Pp. xix, 1118). For a review, by Professor Sturtevant, of this work see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 26:37 (October 31, 1932). C. K.>

¹⁵Walde, under *potis*.

¹⁶See Gardner M. Lane, A Latin Grammar², 712 (New York, American Book Company, 1903). <Why not derive from *sei*, imperative, plus *licet*? C. K.>

¹⁷That is, a dental stop. Various sounds which are not dental stops can be made "with the tip of the tongue...."

¹⁸Kent, § 144 (see note 2, above). ¹⁹Kent, § 150, III.

²⁰Comparia *Etruria*, with long *u*, e. g. in Vergil, Georgics 2.533 sic fortis *Etruria* crevit.

²¹Kent, § 75. ²²Kent, § 160, V, and note.

²³Walde, under *vestigium* (see note 14, above). <Ernout-Meillet (see note 14, above) also regard the *e* of *vestigium* as short. Professor Bennett, The Latin Language (see note 30, below), in § 53, "List of the Most Important Words Containing a Long Vowel Before Two Consonants", gave the *e* of *vestigium* as long (see page 66). So too did Professor Buck, in the Hale-Buck Latin Grammar, § 679, page 300.

²⁴I myself think that makers of Beginners' Latin books and editions of the parts of Latin authors that are commonly read in Schools are justified in accepting, for practical purposes, as their guide such lists as those of Bennett and Buck. C. K.>

²⁵To teachers or pupils who wish to secure accurate information this map will be of little help. In making this map the authors evidently found it quite possible to indicate the type of language spoken in very small districts. Thus e. g. the Basque country is indicated, on the map, by a small white spot. <No names of peoples are shown on this map. C. K.> Why was not proper care taken, in like fashion, with the other parts of the map? A large oval area in the center of South America is supposed to represent territory in which Non-Indo-European tongues are spoken. But this area actually extends all the way to the northeast coast, where the Carib tongue (a non-Indo-European tongue) is spoken. There are other objections to the marking of South America on the map. The marking of North America is approximate, only; no attention is paid to the Aleut dialects. Areas in Northern Sweden where the Finno-Ugric speech is found are marked as Indo-European. The Indo-European belt

The authors' efforts to teach phonology to school children are at least courageous. They might be more helpful if they were more accurate. *Bene* is supposed to come from *bonus* (85:118), and *nemo* from *ne + homo* (90:124); *luna* is said to come directly from *luc-na* (106:145): "In Latin word-formation, **c** is often lost before **n**. Explain the origin of **luna**"²⁵. Adjectives in -er are said to add -rimus to the stem (see Appendix 40:12). They do not add -rimus²⁶. A statement about rhotacism is given in 82, 1:112. Why, then, is so much fuss made (304, first paragraph: 434) about *two* endings -re and -se for the present infinitive active²⁷? The pupil is asked (122, b, 1:168) to tell "What has happened to Latin **c** before **s** in French words", i. e. to French words derived from Latin. Nothing is said about the position of either sound in a word. What will the teacher say to pupils who ask about the relation of French *payer* to Latin *pacare*, or that of *cage* to *cavea*, or that of *louer* to *locare*, or about the doublets *cap* and *chef*, *camp* and *champ*, etc.²⁸ There is a feeble effort (273, 3:393) to introduce the subject of vowel weakening. Nothing is said about an all-important question, whether vowels that weaken are in open syllables or in closed syllables. We read there: "... In the participle **exceptum** (<ex + captum>), it <the a of capere> weakens only to **e**, which <sic!> is less change <than the weakening of a to i in **expicio**>". How is pupil or teacher to know that there is less change involved in going from *a* to *i* than from *a* to *e*? It is a fact of course, but there is nothing in this book to bear out the fact. Suppose pupils get really interested in the subject and confront teachers with words like *contingo* and *satisfacio*? I can find in this book no specific statement, or even hint, that only short vowels weaken, although something which has an indirect connection with the subject is said about short syllables. The authors give, as the derivation of *integer*, *in + tango*. Do they expect users of their book to account, without help, for the *e* in the medial syllable, or for the absence of the *n* before *g*? Can the authors explain these matters²⁹? The attempted explanation (272, 4:392)³⁰ of reduplicated perfects gives strong reason for believing that the authors knew nothing of the similar formation in Greek, or at least did not think of it, and shows beyond doubt that they do not understand reduplication in Latin. The root vowel of verbs is supposed by them to be the vowel in the reduplicating

syllable. The pity of it is that many a teacher will take all this as gospel truth.

I now come to the most pathetic feature of the book. The authors have attempted in many places to explain the formation of cases and tenses from a morphological standpoint. Such explanations cannot be made to any extent in an elementary textbook. To be at all accurate in even a limited application about such matters would require scientific study which is evidently far beyond the attainments of either author of the book under review. I have read every word of their attempted explanations of Latin morphology, and have found scarcely a paragraph in this sphere which is free from error. In connection with both nouns and verbs there is great talk of "inflection vowels". We read, for instance (212, (3):300), that this inflection vowel in consonant stems of the third declension "always appears as e (never i) in the masculine-feminine accusative plural...." Such a statement is enough in itself to show the specialist what the other statements must be like. Consonant stems are so called because they have no 'inflection vowel'. The vowel in the accusative plural of such stems developed from the regular case-ending -ns, which, after a consonant, by regular changes, developed a vowel. This vowel lengthened before -ns; -n was subsequently lost³¹. An elementary study of Latin morphology shows that the terminations of so-called consonant stems and i-stems are so hopelessly entangled and have influenced each other so much that every inflection is a mixture of both types of inflection. It would be idle to cite here the other makeshift rules or alleged explanations which have evolved from the unscientific enthusiasms of the authors. Why, too, must one insist upon classifying third-declension nouns according to their stem-endings? Why teach the declension of *princeps*, for instance, apart from the declension of *miles*?

The discussions of the formation of verbs are just as numerous and just as bad. The authors insist (81:110) that "The -o verbs of Conjugation III lose the inflection vowel before the imperfect tense sign -eba...." This sort of thing is ridiculous. With equal accuracy one could explain the long *e* by saying that it 'sounded better'³². Pupils are then asked why this is so. We are also told, first (30, 1:36), that *fero* "belongs to no regular conjugation", then (156:219) that *fero* is a verb "of no conjugation...." There are elaborate discussions of the formation of the future tenses of all four conjugations (267-273) in which many untruths are set forth. An example is (189:267): "... What happens to the **i** of the tense sign **b(i)** before a vowel?" The answer to this latter must be the same as the answer to another question put by the authors: "What happens to the **i** in the third person plural -bunt?" Since there never was an *i* in either form, pupils will find it rather difficult to discover the answer.

There are many more objectionable matters which might be mentioned here, but enough has been said to show that the book fails signally to furnish teachers

extending across the continent of Eurasia is very much too wide. Included in this belt as Indo-European areas are large Non-Indo-European areas, such as those in which are spoken Turkic, Mongolian, Tugusic, Yakut, etc. Even Korean, Kamchadal, and Yuktash are supposed by Messrs. Grinstead and McDuffee to be Indo-European. So, too, is the Eskimo tongue. Australia is marked as English-speaking over its entire area. This is a great exaggeration. South Africa is similarly marked in areas in which are spoken Dutch, Hottentot, Bushman, and Bantu. Compare especially in this connection Willem Graaff, Language and Languages, Chapter X, and the map which follows that chapter (facing page 436). <For a review, by Professor J. E. Hollingsworth, of this book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27, 138-139 (March 12, 1934). C. K. >

²⁵In each instance see Walde <and Ernout-Meillet: C. K. >, under the proper word (see note 14, above).

²⁶See A. Ernout, Morphologie Historique du Latin², 121 (Paris, Klincksieck, 1927).

²⁷E. Bourcier, La Phonétique Française³, §§ 120, 122, 123 (Paris, Klincksieck, 1926).

²⁸Kent, § 62, note 4, 125, I, C (see note 2, above).

²⁹See Carl Darling Buck, Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin, 352 (University of Chicago Press, 1933); Charles E. Bennett, The Latin Language, § 206 (Allyn and Bacon, 1907). <For a review, by Professor E. H. Sturtevant, of Professor Buck's book, see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27, 158-159 (March 26, 1934). C. K. >

³¹Ernout, 68 (see note 26, above).

³²For scientific discussions of this problem see Ernout, 248-250 (compare note 26, above); F. Sommer, Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre³, 521-522 (Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1914).

and pupils what they have a right to expect in a first-class textbook, that is, a thoroughly scholarly and meticulously accurate presentation of every bit of material. No one expects authors to know a very great deal about *every* part of the field of classical philology, but it is certainly not unreasonable to insist that authors shall seek the advice and criticism of experts in those parts of the field with which they themselves are not familiar.

It is unfortunate that more care was not taken with this book, because in many instances, particularly in English word-study, very fine work has been done. There are likewise many clever and helpful devices which show pedagogical skill and acumen. It is indeed too bad that they are spoiled by their setting.

WILLIAM PENN CHARTER SCHOOL,
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA JOHN FLAGG GUMMERE

THE SIMPLE LIFE AGAIN

More than once in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY I have presented material to show that certain aspects of ancient Roman life are reflected in parts of the modern world. Here belong such articles as the article entitled Hogs, Roman and Modern: Boar Hunting, Ancient and Modern, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 28. 81-84, and the articles there referred to (81 A) in which I presented pictures of life in the Ozark Mountains (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 26.23-24, 89-90).

We are all too apt to forget that certain things (conveniences!) which many a dweller in a large city regards as indispensable are in fact utterly unknown to thousands upon thousands of persons who are either quite unconscious of the existence of such things, or, without the slightest emotional disturbance, or with very little emotional disturbance, go without them.

In the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, February 23, 1935, on the editorial page, I saw an editorial entitled "An Interesting Mental Possibility". This editorial ran as follows:

"In the remaining 79 per cent of the homes considered the women were obliged to care for kerosene lamps," the author of a rural sociology quotes from a survey of ten thousand farm homes of the Northern and Western states. There is no exclamation point after the statement, but, taken in the context, one feels that it should be there. "Imagine such a state of affairs, ladies and gentlemen," one reads between the lines; "nearly 80 per cent of these farm homes still living in the age of the coal-oil lamp!" That less than 10 per cent of them had no central heating system is another fact offered to prove whatever it does prove. Perhaps it proves that people who feel or know that they cannot afford these things are getting along without them—as by far the great majority of the world's population still does; as, until about forty years ago the whole world, you might say, did with no more or no less happiness in it.

When will a reaction from the point of view implied in this startling *aperçu* of rural sociology commence? <When will a reaction commence> from the point of view that sees human life as incomplete, frustrated, if not humiliated, by want of such things, temporary or permanent?....

"It is an interesting mental possibility," the sociologist comments, "for one who is denied certain desirable things to arrive at the conclusion that he is much better off without them." Socrates put it more positively, perhaps, when he said in the marketplace of Athens: "How many things there are in the world I do not want!"

I note that the editorial does not name the specific book or pamphlet from which the editorial quotes. I note also that nothing is said to indicate definitely at what time the survey of 10,000 farm homes of the Northern and Western States was made. I assume that the survey is of very recent date.

CHARLES KNAPP

P
in v
giv
Wa
E

Vo

T
Spe
in t
Sec
app
ma
sch
be
kon
said
have
call
of i

T
dir
a d
hin
was
hor
cid
act
def
and

V
me
is
De
Rh
call
of t
cha
tim
arg
tran
60,
also
(De
triad
mot
issu
fre
it d

The
Col
men
some
ary.
as
1822